DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 511 CS 504 283

AUTHOR Cline, Rebecca J.
TITLE The Cronkite-Ford Interview at the 1980 Republican National Convention: A Therapeutic Analogue.
PUB DATE May 83
NOTE 50p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Dallas, TX, May 26-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Communication Research; Decision Making; *Interpersonal Communication; *Interviews; Metaphors; *News Media; *Politics; Problem Solving; Research Methodology; *Therapy
IDENTIFIERS *Cronkite (Walter); *Ford (Gerald R); Presidential Campaigns

ABSTRACT

Political analysts have regarded the interview of former President Gerald Ford by newsman Walter Cronkite at the 1980 Republican National Convention as important in determining the final party slate, but they have been unable to explain Ford's politically dangerous openness in that interview. The interview and the events leading up to it were examined to determine if it could be better understood as an interpersonal rather than a political communication. Specifically, the examination considered whether using a therapeutic analogue would yield more explanatory power than would traditional political analysis. Using a therapeutic metaphor to structure observation of the interview, Ford is cast as a man beset with personal and political problems, and Cronkite as an interviewer functioning as a facilitator. Measures of verbal and nonverbal facilitation behaviors and an index of client problem solving were used to assess the viability of the metaphor. Results indicated that a majority of Cronkite's statements were facilitative, that he engaged in both verbal and nonverbal facilitative behavior, and that Ford engaged in substantial problem solving. Viewing the interview as therapy yielded findings radically and meaningfully different from those of traditional political analysis. (Author/FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED235511

The Cronkite-Ford Interview at the 1980 Republican National Convention: A Therapeutic Analogue

Rebecca J. Cline

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rebecca J. Cline

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 504 283

Rebecca J. Cline (Ph.D., The Pennsylvania State University, 1975) is Assistant Professor of Speech Communication in the Department of Communication Arts and Theatre, University of Maryland, College Park.

Abstract

Political analysts saw the Cronkite-Ford interview at the 1980 Republican National Convention as important in determining the final slate, but were unable to explain Ford's politically dangerous openness in that interview. The present case study argues that the interview is better understood as interpersonal rather than political communication, in particular, that using a therapeutic analogue yields more explanatory power than did traditional political analysis. In using a therapeutic metaphor to structure observation of the interview, Ford is cast a a man beset with personal and political problems, and Cronkite as an interviewer who functioned as a facilitator. Measures of verbal and nonverbal facilitation behaviors and an index of client problem-solving were used to assess the viability of the metaphor. Results indicate that a majority of Cronkite's statements were facilitative, that he engaged in both verbal and nonverbal facilitative behavior, and that Ford engaged in substantial problem-solving. The discussion contrasts interpersonal and political accounts of the event and assesses the value of the therapeutic metaphor as theory.

The Cronkite-Ford Interview at the 1980 Republican National Convention:

A Therapeutic Analogue

Time: Wednesday, July 16, at approximately 7:05 p.m. Eastern time. The biggest newsmaking event of the 1980 Republican National Convention was unfolding. Rumors gathered wind as a most unusual and unprecedented political event took form: a major political party offering the role of vice-presidential candidate to a former president of the United States.

Early in the evening of the 16th, as rumors trickled out that Ronald Reagan was giving serious consideration to a Reagan-Ford ticket, an event occurred which added grist to the rumor mill and, by its very nature, may have shaped the outcome of the Republican slate. On CBS, Walter Cronkite opened the evening's coverage by informing the audience that "there's a lot of suspense tonight as to who he (Reagan) will name as his vice-presidential running mate."[1] Speculation centered on the prospect of Gerald Ford. A meeting between Ford and Reagan had occurred at 5:15 that evening, in which Reagan made clear that he wanted Ford on the ticket. Then came the critical event: the Cronkite-Ford interview, later termed a turning point in "one of the most memorable evenings in American political history."[2] In that interview Ford made public his willingness to consider the nomination. Ford was openly adament about his unwillingness to be a figurehead vice-president. He expressed "grave reservations" about taking Colorado as his legal residence in order to resolve a Constitutional issue. (The Constitution says that if the running mates share the same home-state the electors of that state cannot vote for both.) And Ford, accepted without question, Cronkite's use of the term "co-presidency," in characterizing the deal in the making.[3]

The Cronkite-Ford interview is the focus of the present study. Although many political analysts saw the interview as important to the outcome of events, they were unable to explain Ford's openness nor the role of the interview in the

final outcome. The present essay agrees that the interview does not make sense from a political perspective. Instead, the essay argues that the interview can be better understood when considered interpersonal communication. An analogue is developed which frames the event as therapeutic in nature. The importance of the interview and political reactions to it are summarized. Using a metaphor as a method of exploring the interview, Ford is cast as a man beset by personal and political problems, and Cronkite as an interviewer who, by his interviewing style, functioned as a nondirective therapist. In an attempt to gather evidence regarding the metaphor's explanatory power, measures of verbal and nonverbal facilitation behaviors and an index of client self-exploration and problem-solving are applied to the interview.

Rationale: Significant But Unexplained History

Never before had a political party seriously considered offering the vice-presidential nomination to a former president of the United States. In fact, one must go back to John Quincy Adams to find a former president who willingly took a lesser office after occupying the highest political office in the land.[4] The Reagan-Ford ticket was conceived weeks in advance of the convention; the idea was dropped when Ford said "no." But it was revived at the convention. The possibility became the focus of concerted effort on the part of Reagan's and Ford's staffs and other Republican leaders at the convention. Finally, it was the source of a nationally televised drama, due to Ford's openness and personal exploration of the problems and possibilities involved, in an interview with Cronkite. Ford's openness "stunned" the Reagan staff, who said they were caught "flatfooted."[5] In a press conference the next morning, even Reagan admitted that he "was caught a little by surprise" by Ford's openness (greatly understating the real shock his aides said he expressed).[6]

Picking up the pieces of the precedent-shattering event, political analysts

were hardpressed to explain the strange series of events and turned to indignant explanations full of disparaging words. Some blamed the media, in general and vague terms, for its role; some pointed, again vaguely, to the interview as somehow pivotal to the political outcome. None were consistent nor convincing. In sum, they were stumped for a political explanation.

Post-analyses were full of shocked jabs directed at the naivete of veteran politicians. Observers judged both Reagan and Ford as appearing to lack the ability to make precise decisions. The concept of a shared presidency was denounced as "batty"[7] and "bizarre,"[8] blowing "the convention temporarily out of reality."[9] The night was portrayed as "crazy,"[10] turning the convention into a "giant hermetic box of rumormongering."[11] The proposal was pronounced "bad politics and worse governance,"[12] and the process of negotiating that proposal and of making the negotiations public was said to have "demeaned" both men.[13] In describing an evening which was said to have "brought the nation to the edge of what could have been a reckless constitutional adventure,"[14] the words "hurly-burly," "frantic," "frenetic," and "untidy"[15] were typical. Many lamented over the risks that could have materialized by enacting the proposal; others worried about the damage already done by giving serious consideration to it.[16]

The media were an obvious target for blame. Little of interest was occurring at the convention and thousands of journalists were there to cover it.[17] Anything resembling a story easily drew attention well beyond its importance.[18] But references to the media's role were vague. Self-critically, journalists asked the questions: "Did the media affect the campaign?" "Did the reporting of the events change the events?"[19] Other journalists answered the questions. Time criticized "the premature reports" which "influenced the actors trying to shape history."[20] The National Review stated that "pressures of television . . . caused people . . . to be carried away."[21] John Chancellor summarized the events

as "politics out of control in the electronic age."[22] The New York Times concluded that "television was paramount in whipping up the story to frenzied proportions."[23]

The Pivotal But Perplexing Interview

Observers who made more specific claims regarding the media's role in the events pointed vaguely to the Cronkite-Ford interview as the interfering culprit. In a "morning-after" interview, Phil Donohue asked Ford: "Couldn't that interview have been what fouled this up?"[24] When Time reported the sequence of events, the phrase "now television stepped in" was used accusingly to introduce discussion of the Cronkite-Ford interview.[25] The Washington Post referred to "those extraordinary interviews,"[26] and Newsweek cited the interview as a "turning point."[27] Jack Kemp made the most direct accusation. Without clearly explaining how or why, Kemp said that: "Television literally affected Reagan's decision. I got the feeling Walter Cronkite was in the middle of history. And that's rather a special role for a network--to be such a force for change in the history of this nation."[28]

Standing in the rubble of the "dream ticket," analysts were stumped in trying to explain Ford's openness about his desires, his potentially damaging revelations in the interview, and the influence of the interview on the final outcome of events. A variety of explanations were posed; there was little consistency nor credibility in them.

A cluster of analysts saw Ford as a man with "a passion for the presidency,"[29] engaging in the "spectacle" because he was "panting for a return" to power.[30] In that vein, Ford was presented as using the interview to pressure Reagan into accepting his demands.[31] Others viewed the interview and the events as an attempt by Ford to embarrass Reagan.[32] For all of the explanations casting Ford as vengeful or engineering a return to power, others argued reasonably that the interview

was scheduled weeks in advance and that the notion of revenge was far out of character for Ford, at that time "the most popular political figure in America."[33] The interview was "chummy;" it had an air of "coziness."[34] From all appearance, it was not the picture of a power-hungry man, using a newtork interview to gain political stature. Some analysts speculated that Reagan was responsible for spreading the word about the possible deal, in order to pressure Ford into accepting.[35] Still others contended that perhaps Reagan engineered the whole sequence in order to make Bush appear more acceptable to the ultra-conservative wing of the party.[36]

But the interview is difficult to understand if one searches for political expediency. Ford's openness both shocked, and precipitated a wave of resentment among, the Reagan people. It gave impetus to specific criticisms of "brief and embarrassing"[37] and "highly public flirtation"[38] among Ford and Reagan. Political analysts argued that the interview, as a prominant source of public knowledge of the negotiations, gave Reagan something else he would have to explain,[39] made Reagan seem disorganized and careless and Ford insensitive and vindictive.[40] From a purely political stance the Cronkite-Ford interview is an incomprehensible and major error in political strategy.

Observers' speculations share two things in common. (1) They provide weak explanation for the event in question, yielding more questions than answers about how and why events occurred as they did. (2) All presume that the interview is best understood as political communication. In an attempt to further explore and understand the Cronkite-Ford interview, this author starts with two assumptions. (1) The first was vaguely referred to by political analysts: the interview with Cronkite was pivotal to the political outcome. (2) Ford's target audience was not Reagan, nor the viewing audience, but was Cronkite himself. Ford's behavior can be best understood when viewed as a case of interpersonal communication.

The Sequence of Events

Months in advance, Ronald Reagan had locked-up the 1980 G.O.P. nomination. The remaining key decision was the naming of a vice-presidential running mate. We now know that about six weeks prior to the convention Reagan visited Ford in California and asked whether Ford would be interested in being the vice-presidential candidate. Ford reported his answer as "Governor Reagan, categorically no."[41] Ford said from that time on he never considered the offer, until Tuesday during the convention in Detroit.[42] By that time the following names appeared and reappeared as possible contenders: Bush, Baker, Laxalt, Kemp, Rumsfeld, Vander Jagt, Lugar. There was no sense that the choice had been seriously narrowed, and in fact, spokemen for Reagan that Sunday insisted that he had not made up his mind.[43] In a private meeting with Reagan on Tuesday afternoon, Ford had made his personal choice more explicit: Ford told Reagan that Bush was the best choice.[44] Convention support leaned toward Bush, with five of six leaders who met with Reagan endorsing Bush.[45] Bush picked up endorsements from key delegations, but Reagan still insisted that he hadn't made up his mind. (Note: this was twenty-four hours before Reagan's nomination, forty-eight hours before the running mate's nomination.) In the Tuesday meeting with Reagan, Ford argued the importance of a strong running mate, and again attempted to convey the message that "he would not--under any circumstances--take the No. 2 spot and create what Reagan chairman Paul Laxalt called 'a dream ticket.'"[46] But, in deference to Reagan, Ford relented to having a group of his advisors meet with the Reagan camp to explore the issue.[47]

Tuesday was a critical day from several perspectives. It was the first sign that For was undecided; previously his responses had been a categorical "no." Pressured to find a running mate who would add to the ticket, for what was thought sure to be a close election, and with Ford's hint of even a limited willingness, core party members began to take steps to firm up the prospect.[48]

Ford associates, including Marsh, Kissinger, and Greenspan, began exploring the possibility. Other party leaders organized to try to change Ford's position. They included Brock, Griffin, Thompson, Cheney, Dole, and Clements. Kissinger became involved late Tuesday night, arguing that a state of national emergency existed, making such unprecedented steps necessary.[49]

Wednesday was a day of frantic negotiations, rapid consolidating of efforts to forge that "dream ticket."[50] Ford showed even clearer signs of wavering on Wednesday morning. He appeared on NBC's "Today Show," saying he was willing to consider seeing if a significant vice-presidential role could be determined.[51] The door seemed open. The Ford people met with the Reagan people on Wednesday afternoon, but were still talking only at the level of a "broad conceptual framework." However broad, the camps seemed in agreement.[52] Later Wednesday afternoon, the door seemed to have slammed shut once more. In an interview for The New York Times, Ford cited constitutional considerations as the "principal" reason he would not run for vice-president.[53] He said he could not foresee any circumstances which would make him change his mind. And so, less than two hours before the Cronkite-Ford interview Ford said he would not accept the nomination under any circumstances.[54] Reagan and Ford met once more, between 5:00 and 5:30 p.m.

Then came the interview. At its end, Ford did not seem a man who would not possibly consider running for vice-president. Instead, he seemed a man excited by the prospect, eager to resolve the constitutional issues (while maintaining his ethical posture), and anxious to help the Republican party. From the point of the interview on, the momentum and tone of the convention changed. Up to this point, the main stumbling block was Ford's personal hesitations. Now he seemed to be making a concerted effort at resolving those hesitations. Throughout the convention, as the night wore on, aides "leaked"

that there would be a Reagan-Ford ticket, that the issues were resolved, the pact signed. In the end, Ford was undecided, and Reagan gave a deadline. At 10:00 p.m. Ford was still undecided.[55] By 11:45, he gave up, finally deciding that the "meaningful role" he had hope for could not be.

The Analogue: Nationally Televised Therapy

Metaphor as Theory

Metaphors provide a way of organizing thinking, of creating new systems of thought.[56] If a theory is considered "a way of making sense of a disturbing situation . . .,"[57] then a metaphor may be used as a method of organizing the "disturbing" into "sense." Black's interaction view of metaphor is invoked here.[58] Proposing to view a "political event" as an "interpersonal, therapeutic event" involves the juxtaposing of "two ideas, symbols, or concepts previously thought to be unrelated"[59] with the hope of creating new ideas and a new understanding. In the remainder of this essay, I explore the Cronkite-Ford interview as a case of nondirective therapy. I do not claim that either party viewed nor intended the interview as such; instead I address the following question: Can viewing the interview with a therapeutic analogue shed light on otherwise inexplicable political events?

What Is Therapy?

Ruesch outlined the ingredients of therapeutic communication as including: a "therapeutic mileau" which he describes as "the perception that the other person has a certain readiness to understand, to acknowledge, and to reply,"[60] a reliance upon spontaneous expression, an emphasis on the importance of the present (as compared to the past or future), and an emphasis on self-realization as more important than adjustment. Strupp's list of basic ingredients for psychotherapy correspond closely to Ruesch's.[61] Strupp said that "the therapist creates and maintains a helping relationship characterized by respect,

interest, understanding, tact, maturity, and a firm belief in his ability to help."[62] From this a power base develops. Strupp also identified the client's capacity and willingness to profit from the experience as essential (similar to Ruesch's emphasis on self-realization). Most psychotherapists recognize therapy as an interpersonal influence process.[63] Thus, to understand the therapeutic process, one needs to view behaviors by both the therapist and the client.

Facilitative Conditions

Despite the "bewildering array of theories and practice in counseling and psychotherapy," many themes recur. Psychoanalytic, client-centered, and various eclectic theorists have agreed on the importance of the therapist's sensitive and accurate understanding, warmth and acceptance in a nonpossessive manner, and genuineness.[64] Evidence suggests that more similarity exists among effective therapists of differing schools than among therapists, in general, of the same school of therapy.[65] The feeling of being understood was deemed critical: "the most important dimension which differentiates experts from nonexperts is related to the therapist's ability to understand, to communicate with, and to maintain rapport with the patient."[66]

Rogers outlined the critical conditions for therapeutic change: the client is "in a state of incongruence, being vulnerable or anxious;" the therapist experiences congruence, experiences an unconditional positive regard for the client, experiences an empathic understanding of the client, and the therapist is able to communicate those experiences to the client.[67] Rogers and Truax summarized and defined elements in effective therapy.[68] They defined congruence as a matter of being integrated and genuine, of being open with the client, and without front or facade. Unconditional positive regard is a deep and genuine caring for the client as a person with potential; a warm acceptance

of the client's experiences is central to this regard. Accurate empathic understanding means being sensitive to the client's world, the client's meanings and experiences. Rogers and Truax hypothesized that the degree to which these conditions are present in therapy is predictive of process movement by the client and overall degree of constructive client change.

A Man with a Problem

Ford entered the interview as a man beset with personal and political problems. He was the picture of incongruence; first refusing to discuss the negotiations but then quickly revealing previously secret details, he disclosed material usually reserved for smoke-filled backrooms. His feelings of dissonance were obvious: simultaneously holding grave reservations but displaying weakly veiled enthusiasm over the possibilities being negotiated. He expressed an awareness of his own vulnerability, worrying about losing his "good reputation."[69] His anxiety was apparent in his concern for being misinterpreted.[70] In short, he epitomized the client characteristics which Rogers listed.

The basis of Ford's indecisiveness was not just political; perhaps it would have been easier if it was. Instead, the matter was highly personal from three vantages: a major career decision, personal ethics, and family considerations.

Ford showed signs of really wanting to re-enter politics, but also of wanting to retain his position as a popular and esteemed statesman. Ford's decision not to run for president came at the last possible moment in the spring of 1980. He was described then as "desperate to run"[71] and "bursting again to run."[72] When he finally decided against running, largely because of his advisors thought he could not win, he called it "the toughest decision of my life."[73] Now, if he chose to stay out of the arena, he again had to confront the issue of the end of his career in politics; the warm reception to

his Monday night speech only made the stepping out more difficult. He was described as "not ready to pass the torch."[74] Having made the decision once, he had it to do all over again, this time with an additional ethical problem.

As the decision was framed, the choice to be running mate required a compromise in his own ethical posture. He expressed the Constitutional problems raised, regarding Reagan and Ford being residents of the same state, as creating an "unworkable, unhealthy situation." While he could establish residency in Colorado, he called such a move a "cheap political gimmick,"[75] about which he held "very grave reservations."[76] He was clearly "bothered" by the prospect,[77] fearful of losing something--losing that image of being a good and trustworthy man--and losing some self-esteem in the process.

Ford and his family were apparently leading more comfortable, healthy, and less harried lives out of politics. Family considerations had ranked high in Ford's earlier decision not to run for president. In her autobiography, Mrs. Ford reported that on the morning after Ford lost the presidential race to Carter that she had been singing. Her daughter Susan was upset at Mrs. Ford's apparent happiness. Mrs. Ford replied, "You kids got a father back, and I got my husband back."[78] Ford's own children had urged political leaders to discourage his presidential candidacy in 1980. Mrs. Ford was reported to have sat through the Reagan-Ford negotiations in "some discomfort," asking "Why us again?"[79] In the interview with Phil Donohue, she admitted that after the decision was made she was "greatly relieved," and that she was "quite worried" but "didn't want to admit it until it was all over."[80] So, although the prospect of holding office again may have been enticing to the former president, his personal ethics and family pressures worked against the possibility.

The issue that could not be resolved, and finally determined Ford's decision was the need to define a "meaningful role" in concrete terms. But the

other problems distracted him. The interview is described as "pivotal."[81] It was pivotal in terms of the problems Ford attended to. Sometime that evening, with the interview as the apparent precipitator, the personal problems suddenly seemed to be surmountable, and Ford's thinking shifted, giving more intense focus to the political problem of defining the specific responsibilities and powers he would have as vice-president. Ford had entered the interview focused on personal problems, but apparently left the interview focused on his political goals and needs. After the interview, Ford's negotiations focused on the "meaningful role." Reports of what he negotiated for in later sessions include vetoes over key appointments, such as Secretary of Defense and Treasury, the role of Director of the Office of Management and Budget, "superdirector" of the National Security Council, a "shared" presidency, a "co-presidency," the role of "superdirector of the executive office of the presidency."[82] What became clearer in Ford's mind, throughout the evening, as triggered by the interview, was his own sense of that elusive term "meaningful role." According to both Reagan and Ford aides, as the evening progressed, Ford "upped the ante."[83] As the meaning became clearer in Ford's own mind, the likelihood of it becoming an actuality decreased. In the course of the evening, for Ford, the term "meaningful role" had progressed from a vague and hopeful notion, to concrete and specific needs and responsibilities. In short, he had experienced greater self-understanding, what might be called therapeutic change. Thus, the use of a therapeutic analogue is appropriate to the case.

Relevant Research

In order to argue that therapy had taken place, evidence was needed supporting the existence of two phenomena: (1) a therapeutic mileau or set of facilitative conditions on the part of the Cronkite, and (2) some self-realization, capacity for profit, or concerted focus on problem-solving by Ford. In

order to identify what those criteria meant in terms of observable behavior the following literature review was completed.

Therapist Contributions

Facilitative conditions. Most research centered on determining what the therapist's contributions are to therapeutic conditions has evolved from the humanistic school of psychotherapy, specifically from the client-centered orientation.[84] But all schools of therapy acknowledge the importance of the therapeutic relationship to therapeutic change. In reviewing pertinant literature, Truax and Mitchell concluded:

> These studies taken together suggest that therapists or counselors who are accurately empathic, nonpossessively warm in attitude, and genuine are indeed effective. Also, these findings seem to hold with a wide variety of therapists and counselors, regardless of their training or theoretic orientation, and with a wide variety of clients . . . Further, the evidence suggests that these findings hold in a variety of therapeutic contexts and in both individual or group psychotherapy or counseling.[85]

Truax and Mitchell cited evidence that clients experiencing low levels of the three facilitative conditions not only failed to improve, but became worse. While the sum of evidence suggests that these conditions may not be necessary and sufficient to therapeutic change,[86] they do appear linked to client change in consistent manner.[87]

The therapeutic conditions appear important because of their potency in eliciting specific client behaviors. For example, Truax found that judges' ratings of facilitative conditions were significantly related to the extent of intrapersonal exploration by the client.[88] Later research supported the

contention that: "the greater degree of self-exploration or transparency during psychotherapy, the greater constructive personality change in the client."[89] Bundza and Simonson found that the therapist's disclosure was linked to client disclosure: "the therapist who made warm, accepting, self-disclosing remarks to the client . . . impressed the subjects as being the most nurturant and elicited the greatest willingness to self-disclose."[90] Thus therapist and client congruency interact. Therapist congruency leads to client self-exploration, which in turn impacts therapeutic outcome.

Facilitative messages. Some forms of interpersonal messages are perceived as, and responded to as, more facilitative than others. The primary message form in nondirective therapy is the reflective statement. Reflective listening is an active form of listening in which the listener paraphrases the other, in an attempt to communicate an understanding the other's experiences, feelings, and attitudes. Reflective listening is a key form of therapist communication in nondirective therapy and has been linked to the client's: shifting from an external to an internal locus of evaluation, acceptance of self and others, insight into interpersonal problems, and behavioral maturity.[91]

Thomas Gordon, author of Parent Effectiveness Training, distinguished I-messages from you-messages.[92] He theorized that I-messages communicate a greater sense of personal responsibility for self, acceptance of other, and a lack of threat. I-messages focus on self, on the feelings, perceptions, and experiences of self. Persons using I-messages tend to be perceived as empathic, genuine, and accepting.[93] You-messages are characterized by focusing on the other person, communicating that self is taking responsibility for the other and that the other is responsible for self. In comparison to I-messages, you-messages tend to elicit defensive communication responses.[94]

Questions may be categorized as open or closed in nature. Open questions

are designed to increase the possible number of responses to them, while closed questions are designed to limit the range of possible responses. Open questions are viewed as nondirective relative to closed questions.[95] While open questions clearly involve a giving of direction, relative to closed questions, they offer freedom in choosing a response. Thus open questions are viewed as more facilitative than closed questions. Research suggests that responses to open questions tend to be longer, more subjective, and contain a bigger proportion of self-revelation than responses to closed questions.[96]

Nonverbal facilitation. Certain nonverbal behaviors also function facilitatively. (Only those behaviors which could be measured reliably from the available videotape are summarized below.)

Much research supports eye contact as a component of the evaluative dimension in nonverbal communication. Research by Merhabian and others indicates that eye contact is important in communicating a positive attitude[97] or liking for the other person.[98] In general, facial activity indicates attentiveness. In therapy studies, eye contact has been associated with empathy,[99] warmth,[100] respect,[101] and genuineness,[102] as well as with facilitation in general.[103]

Smiling is also indicative of affiliation,[104] attractiveness, and persuasiveness,[105] as well as with the facilitative conditions.[106] Smiling was found to be a predictor of warmth,[107] empathy,[108] acceptance,[109] respect,[110] and genuineness.[111]

Forward leaning communicates positive attitudes.[112] It is indicative of immediacy, of attending to the other person. Forward leaning communicates empathy,[113] warmth,[114] respect, and genuineness,[115] as well as attraction and persuasiveness.[116] Forward leaning has been consistently supported as facilitative.[117]

Finally, hand-clasping by the therapist is a particularly powerful indicator of facilitation.[118] Hand-clasping is also associated with liking and affiliation,[119] as well as with immediacy.[120]

Several of these studies show interaction effects among the cues, which indicate that when the behaviors occur as a system they are even more powerful in communicating facilitation than when they occur independently.[121]

Client Contributions

Truax and Carkhuff, and others, have pointed to the importance of client exploration in the therapeutic process. Rogers indicated that in therapy, a client is experiencing some incongruency, or is anxious and vulnerable.[122] As the client engages in self-exploration, he/she is contributing by not yielding to the threats involved in self-exploration of problems. That problem-expression has several characteristics: it (1) focuses on a problem, (2) includes personal and direct involvement in the problem, (3) includes reactions to, and understanding of, the problem, and (4) discusses resolution.[123]

Research Questions

If, as is argued herein, the Cronkite-Ford interview can be better understood as a therapeutic interview than as a purely political event, the following questions need to be answered:

Q_1: To what extent did Cronkite's interviewing style create facilitative conditions (i.e., a therapeutic mileau)?

Q_2: To what extent did Ford engage in problem-expression?

METHODS

Data

Data for the analyses of the Cronkite-Ford interview consisted of a videotape and a transcript of the interview.[124] The interview was conducted on Wednesday evening, July 16, 1980 in the CBS Convention anchor booth.

Operational Definitions

Facilitator Contributions

Facilitative messages. Facilitative message types were defined as reflective listening, I-messages, and open-questions. Nonfacilitative message types were defined as you-messages and closed questions. Information-giving statements (those supplying information to the viewing audience, and clearly not addressed to the interviewee) were considered neutral in terms of facilitation. Facilitative and nonfacilitative messages types were operationalized as the proportions of thought units by Cronkite identified by coders as fitting into the categories as defined above.

Empathy. Empathy involves the ability of the therapist to sense the private world of the client and to know what the client means; thus empathic communication identifies the underlying feelings of the client. In this study, empathic communication consisted of the proportion of one-minute segments of talk in which Cronkite's responses were rated above the midpoint of "5" on Truax's Accurate Empathy Scale.[125] Nonempathic communication consisted of the proportion of one-minute segments of talk in which Cronkite's responses were rated below "5" on Truax's Accurate Empathy Scale.

Acceptance. Acceptance was defined as warm and unconditional regard, in which a deep caring or concern is communicated. In this study, accepting communication consisted of the proportion of one-minute segments in which Cronkite's responses were rated above the midpoint of "5" on the rating scale for Unconditional Positive Regard.[126] Nonaccepting communication consisted of the proportion of one-minute segments in which Cronkite's responses were rated below the midpoint of "5" on the rating scale.

Congruence. Congruence was defined as genuine, spontaneous, and honest communication, in which verbal and nonverbal messages seem to be parallel. In

this study, congruence consisted of the proportion of one-minute segments in which Cronkite's responses were rated above the midpoint of "5" on the Scale for Rating Congruence.[127] Noncongruence consisted of the proportion of one-minute segments in which Cronkite's responses were rated below "5" on the scale.

Nonverbal facilitation. Nonverbal facilitation was operationalized in terms of four behaviors. Smiling was defined as a gesture involving an upwardly turned mouth. Eye contact was defined as the direct looking of one person into the other's eyes or general area of the face. Forward leaning referred to forward leaning of the trunk of one person toward another. Hand-clasping referred to the interlocking of hands or the grasping of one hand with the other. In this study, the cues were operationalized as the proportion of time spent by Cronkite engaging in each of the behaviors above (when shown on the screen). Timing was completed in one-minute segments with a stopwatch. The author and a research assistant timed all nonverbal cues.

Client Contributions

Problem-expression refers to a speaker's references to a problem that person is experiencing. A problem can be ignored, or can be acknowledged only superficially, or can be dealt with directly in terms of feelings about the problem and possible solutions. In this study problem-expression meant the relative proportion of one-minute segments in which Ford was judged as expressing problems at levels "5" through "7" on van der Veen and Tomlinson's Scale for Rating Manner of Problem Expression.[128] Nonproblem-expression behavior referred to the proportion of one-minute segments in which Ford used problem expression levels "1" through "3" on the scale.

Procedures

Coding

Two coders were trained to rate conversations on each of the four scales

used in the study. They were unaware of the purposes of the study. Training sessions were held in which terms were defined, examples provided and discussed, and practice samples rated. Using one scale at a time, the coders viewed the videotape and rated the designated behavior. For the purposes of rating, the interview was divided into one-minute segments. Each segment received a rating on each scale. After the rating system was completed, the coders were asked to go back and recode a sample of 15 segments in order to measure intra-coder reliability. Where disagreements in the ratings occurred, the two ratings were averaged. Where reliability was insufficient, the investigator served as a rater along with one of the trained raters.[129]

Two coders read interview segments placed in a randomized order and categorized Cronkite's talk in terms of message types. For the purposes of coding, the interviews were divided into interacts, consisting of an interviewee utterance, followed by Cronkite's response. Each utterance was divided into thought units for coding purposes. A thought unit was considered similar to a sentence, with each thought unit representing a completed thought. Following the categorizing of the interviews according to message types, the coders were asked to re-code a sample of interacts in order to check intra-coder reliability.

RESULTS

Reliability

Intra-rater and inter-rater reliabilities were computed for all measures of facilitation and problem-solving. Results are summarized in Table 1.

Enter Table 1 about here

Due to inadequate reliablility for the measure of acceptance, results of that measure were deleted from the analysis

Cronkite as Facilitator

Facilitative messages. Results of the coding of Cronkite's verbalizations

in terms of facilitative and nonfacilitative messages and information giving are summarized in proportion form in Table 2.

Enter Table 2 about here

43% of Cronkite's thought units were facilitative; 38% were nonfacilitative. When the neutral information-giving messages were eliminated, 53% of the remaining messages were facilitative. When the form of the questions asked were considered, 39% of Cronkite's questions were open-ended, 61% were closed. As a comparison, when Hawes conducted his study of the directive and nondirective interviewing styles of doctors, he considered the use of 26.5% open questions to be extremely nondirective.[130] Cronkite's style was even more nondirective by comparison.

Facilitative conditions. Results of the ratings of Cronkite's communication in terms of facilitative conditions are summarized in Table 3.

Enter Table 3 about here

By the standards set in this study, Cronkite was empathic during 71% of the interview and was congruent during 81% of the interview. Cronkite's average ratings for both of these facilitative conditions (5.79 and 3.86, respectively) were well above the standards for minimal therapeutic facilitation suggested by Truax and Carkhuff. For a therapist to be helpful, Truax and Carkhuff expected a minimum average of 3.5 - 4 on the empathy scale and of 2.5 on the genuineness scale.[131]

Nonverbal facilitation cues. Data for nonverbal cues were summarized in terms of the proportions of time Cronkite spent engaging in the behaviors. Cronkite engaged in all of the cues, except smiling, during more than 50% of the interview. Previous research indicates that, on the average, eye contact occurs in two-person conversations during 50-61% of the time. Cronkite engaged

in eye contact during 75% of the interview, well above the norms suggested.[132]

While no clear standards exist for most of the cues, Cronkite clearly engaged in facilitative nonverbal cues during the majority of the interview. He smiled 37% of the time, engaged in forward leaning 98% of the time, and had clasped hands during 57% of the interview. Most of the time, he engaged in more than one cue simultaneously. Research indicates that when the cues occur in combination with each other, they are even more powerful facilitators. For example, Tepper and Haase found that eye contact, forward leaning, and verbal facilitation were more powerful in combination than the sum of their effects separately.[133] Forward leaning, Cronkite's most constant nonverbal cue, was reported by Kelly to be the most powerful indication of positive attitudes by the therapist to the client.[134]

Ford as Client

In order to address the general question of whether Ford functioned as a client in the interview, a measure of problem-expression was applied to his talk. The average rating for Ford on the seven-point Problem-Expression Scale was 5.41, well above the midpoint of 3.5. Further, 64% of the minutes in the interview were rated above 3.5, and only 33% were rated below 3.5. Ford spent the majority of the interview engaged in problem-expression.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the Cronkite-Ford interview at the 1980 Republican National Convention via a therapeutic analogue. Evidence indicates that politicians and journalists alike were hardpressed to understand and explain Ford's openness about his political desires in that interview. While observers pinpointed the interview as a turning-point in the evening's decision-making, they were unable to state in clear and precise terms why the interview occurred as it did nor how it affected the outcome of events. This

author proposed to view the interview as an interpersonal rather than as a political event.

In their book, Professional Interviewing, Downs, Smeyak, and Martin argued that counseling occurs in a variety of contexts.[135] "Sometimes this activity is very formal; at other times it seems to happen informally, or almost imperceptibly. Sometimes it is sought; at other times people seem to volunteer their services. In a sense, therefore, a form of counseling takes place in other interviews . . ."[136] Indeed, what otherwise appears to be a journalistic interview might function as counseling for the participants.

As the metaphor developed in the case study, Cronkite was presented as an interviewer functioning as a nondirective therapist and Ford, a man beset by personal and political problems to be resolved by the evening's end. For Ford, the interview came at the end of a hectic and exhausting three days. A review of his Wednesday schedule shows that, from early morning until the interview, he had little, if any, time alone, or with his wife, to give careful thought to the personal issues involved in the situation. Media interviews and negotiation meetings focused on political issues. An interview with a respected, trustworthy, and warmly caring Cronkite may have been Ford's only opportunity to reflect on his many personal feelings. After considering the pace of Ford's schedule that day, one prominant Republican observed that "Ford was just too tired to think it all out clearly."[137]

Results of this study indicate substantial facilitation by Cronkite. The majority of his utterances were facilitative; he was rated well above the standards for minimal facilitation by a therapist on the dimensions of empathy and congruence. Cronkite consistently engaged in nonverbal facilitative behaviors as well: smiling, eye contact, forward leaning, and hand-clasping. For his part, Ford engaged in problem-expression throughout the interview, averag-

ing well above the midpoint of the problem-expression scale, a measure typically used in therapy research.

Down et al. indicated that the aim of counseling is helping to understand, adapt to, or solve problems, and those problems may be personal or work-related. Thus, the Cronkite-Ford interview may be seen as a turning point in the process; and the eventual outcome of the evening was Ford's resolution of his personal hesitations and ultimately focusing on his needs and goals which lead him to realize the impossibility of a Reagan-Ford ticket. As such, the interview functioned to assist Ford in understanding himself and adapting to and solving the problems he faced. In sum, the evidence provides credibility to the view that the interview was an interpersonal exchange, functioning as therapy, which played an important role in Ford's final decision regarding the vice-presidential nomination.

A national viewing audience witnessed Ford, with Cronkite's facilitation, as he wrestled with personal dimensions of the political situation he faced. The flavor of the interview is captured convincingly in selected parts of the dialogue. The interview opened on a note of lightheartedness and mutual respect. Because Dan Rather had just reported the rumor of a Reagan-Ford ticket from the convention floor, Cronkite was forced to begin the interview on that topic, Ford's initial response indicated a tight-lipped stance from which viewers had little warning to expect the detailed self-disclosures that ensued:

> CRONKITE: You've never had such a chance to have your reporting checked at the source as you have right this minute tonight. Stay tuned, because former President Ford is our guest now in our anchor booth here overlooking the studio, and he heard most of your report, Dan, not all of it. But from what you heard, can you verify that Dan's reporting is accurate today?

Now you're not going to go back on Dan? (Laughter)

GERALD FORD: Well, Walter, I've learned a long time ago that I'm not going to get into any dispute with the news media as to whether they're right or I'm right. It is true that I did have a– a meeting with Governor Reagan this afternoon. I'm not at liberty, of course, to make any comment on what transpired. I am interested in what Dan reported, but I better stop there.[138]

Cronkite established the rudiments of facilitation early. After Ford reiterated that he had come to the convention, not as a candidate, but to help his party, and that his position regarding the vice-presidential nomination did not differ from his position when he had met with Reagan six weeks earlier, Cronkite responded with reflective listening:

FORD: Walter, I-- I think you, in all fairness, ought to let me tell you the basis upon which Betty and I cam her from Vail, Colorado. [We came not asking for a job. We came here not expecting any future political responsibilities. We came here to indicate our full support for Governor Reagan and the Republican ticket. We are committed to doing all we possibly can to achieve that result. All of these developments that have transpired in the last several days are totally contrary to what we anticipated and expected, and our position today is exactly what it was six weeks ago when I met with Governor Reagan. We haven't changed, and therefore I'm not in a position to show any deference in the future as to what we expected when we came here.]

CRONKITE: Well, that position six weeks ago was that you would not be a candidate for the Vice Presidency.[139]

The portion of Ford's response bracketed above was rated a "7" on the problem-expression scale. Ford accepted Cronkite's reflection and continued. Cronkite followed with an I-message which functioned reflectively and which had only a slightly questioning tone, typical of reflective listening:

> FORD: And I told Governor Reagan that at the time, and I'm reiterating it-- the position as of now.
>
> CRONKITE: So that we--I-- I assume that you can project that, that you are going to tell him at some point tonight, so that he can get on with other matters, other considerations, that you would not accept that post?[140]

Cronkite approached the subject again, using an open question, clearly directed at the feelings that Ford must have felt in response to the warm reception to his Monday night speech at the convention; Ford's reaction to the question focused on feelings and the expression of the problems he was then facing. He used the word "tough" to describe the decision and discussed "fairness" and "responsibility" among his personal concerns:

> CRONKITE: Mister President, the-- there are a lot of governors and senators her who are talking about a draft-Ford movement, and there's even been some suggestion that Governor Reagan would support such a movement from the floor just to convince you, if you need any convincing--I don't think you do after that demonstration for you the other night here, but if you needed any convincing--that the party wants you, needs you, feels that it is your duty to answer a call. What would happen if they got out there on that floor tonight or tomorrow and said, "It's got to be Gerald Ford"?
>
> FORD: It would be tough, but I really believe that, in all

> fairness to me, if there is to be any change, it has to be predicated on the arrangements that I would expect as a Vice President in a relationship with the President. I would not go to Washington, Walter, and be a figurehead Vice President. If I go to Washington--and I'm not saying that I am accepting--I have to go there with the-- the belief that I will play a meaningful role across the board in the basic and the crucial and the important decisions that have to be made in a four-year period. For me to go there and go through the ceremonial aspects, it wouldn't be fair to Betty, it wouldn't be fair to me, it wouldn't be fair to the President, and it wouldn't be right for the country. So, I have to-- before I can even consider any revision in the firm position I have taken, I have to have responsible assurances. Otherwise, I'm going to campaign, and I'll do my best, but it'll be in a non-office seeking responsibility.[141]

Cronkite's above utterance was rated a "7" on the empathy scale and a "4" on the congruence scale; Ford's response was rated a "7" on the problem-expression scale.

Cronkite's followup to Ford's elaboration of his problems and feelings was again focused on feelings, sympathy and pride, as he asked another open question. Ford's answer was at a feeling level as he discussed pride, hurt, self-assurance, and understanding:

> CRONKITE: Those very sympathetic to your position, and that's most politicians here in-- in Detroit, appreciate the matter of pride, obviously--the President of the United States becoming the Vice President of the United States. But what about the pride of a President of the

United States accepting a former President as his Vice President, and one who, as in your case, has said, "It's got to be something like a co-presidency"?

FORD: That's something that Governor Reagan really ought to consider. Neither Betty nor myself would have any sense that our pride would be hurt if we went there as our number two instead of number one. We've been around that city a long time, Walter, and I think we're big enough, we're self-assured enough, that that problem wouldn't affect us in any way whatsoever. But the point you raised is a very legitimate one. We have a lot of friends in Washington, and the-- the President-to-be--and I hope it's Ronald Reagan--he has to also have pride. And for him to not understand the realities of some of things that might happen in Washington is being oblivious to reality.[142]

Cronkite's utterance above was rated an "8" on empathy and a "4" on congruence; Ford's response was rated 6.5 on problem-expression.

Later on, when Ford said that he and Mrs. Ford would be going back to their hotel to watch the convention on TV, Cronkite quipped an I-message and they laughed together: "You're going to hear an awful lot of talk about yourself on that--on that thing, I think."[143] Still later, after Cronkite chatted with Mrs. Ford, he remarked in an I-message showing both warmth and respect: "I must say that you're the youngest looking elder statesman I've ever seen.[144] The continuing interaction regarding Ford's and Reagan's age is feeling-filled and respectful on the part of both parties:

CRONKITE: At 67 and 69, you look like you ought to be on the football team, both of you, but-- as both of you have been, I

guess, in the past. But is that a-- do you think that's a problem, a consideration?

FORD: I don't think so, Walter. Truth is I've never been in better health than I am at the present time. I'm in better health than I have (been) over the last 30 years. I've lost weight. I feel good. And age is a relative thing. You say that, the older you get, as you will find. But--

CRONKITE: I'm saying it quite a lot these days. (Laughter)

FORD: But anyhow, it's a state of mind, it's a actual state of your physical health, but as long as you're active and feel good and everything is working--and I think that's absolutely true in the case of Governor Reagan, I know it's true in my case. We'd be a pretty healthy team. But don't come to the wrong conclusion now. (Laughs)

CRONKITE: That's-- well, we're going to jump to conclusions all over the place tonight.[145]

Cronkite's first two utterances above were rated an "8" on empathy and a "5" on congruence. His third utterance above is reflective; it acknowledged and confirmed the delicacy of the present situation in which Ford realized that anything he said would be scrutinized for political motives.

A three-minute portion of the interview stands out in contrast to the remainder of the interview; in it Cronkite questioned Ford about the Constitutional issues regarding the residency of candidates. In this segment, Cronkite seemed uncomfortable with his own line of questioning. When Ford indicated his personal reservations on the issue, Cronkite hastened to present an argument rather than a reflection:

CRONKITE: Legally, there's virtually no problem. Apparently

> in Michigan and Colorado, all you've got to do is just register and say "Im receiving my mail at this address." Rent a house or anything of the kind will do it.[146]

The rate at which Cronkite delivered the above utterance indicates his discomfort; earlier he seemed relaxed and allowed Ford to set a relatively slow and comfortable pace. Here he delivered the utterance in 8 seconds, at a rate of 4.75 words per second, considerably faster than his preceding utterances. (Those were delivered at the following rates: 4.00, 3.64, 3.06, 2.63, 3.15, 2.67, and 4.00 words per second, respectively.) During further questioning on the residence issue, Cronkite made several false-starts and speech disruptions, atypical of his speech in the rest of the interview. Also during that segment, he shifted his spatial orientation, leaning forward and then back several times quickly; throughout the rest of the interview he maintained a forward lean. Thus, Cronkite appeared uncomfortable with more than gentle probing on such a delicate issue.

That three-minute segment is described in detail because it was so out of character with the rest of the interview. In those three minutes (11-13), Cronkite smiled only 18% of the time (compared to 37% overall), engaged in eye contact 31% of the time (compared to 75% overall), leaned back and forth 4 times (of a total of 6 during the approximately 23-minute interview), and clasped his hands only 38% of the time (compared to 57% for the total interview). Apart from that three-minute period in which Cronkite drastically reduced his facilitative behavior, the overall average facilitation is higher than indicated by the means and proportions presented here. The majority of Cronkite's verbal and nonverbal behavior functioned in a facilitative or helpful way. Cronkite's concluding statement to the Fords was more typical of his style throughout the interview:

CRONKITE: Thank you very much, Mrs. Ford, President Ford. Good luck to you in these immediate ensuing days. I hope the decision is the one you want it to be.[147]

The Value of Metaphor as Theory

How does explanation by analogue differ from, or represent an improvement over more traditional modes or explanation? When approaching the present case as a political event, the traditional method of explanation is to search for hidden motives and disguised maneuvers by participants who are assumed to have their behavior organized toward making gains in their own political standing. That approach rendered less than satisfying explanations (summarized earlier). Using a therapeutic analogue changed the focus and products of the analysis in some important and revealing ways.

1. Through therapeutic analysis, Ford's openness becomes explainable. Political analysis of the interview focused on the political principle involved, Ford, and his motivations and hidden agendas. Cronkite was ignored. The therapeutic analogue shifted attention to the interpersonal relationship between Ford and Cronkite. Because therapeutic analysis emphasized mutual interpersonal processes, the behaviors of both Ford and Cronkite were investigated. Observing Cronkite's style as facilitator helped to explain why Ford engaged in blatantly open self-exploration which amounted to a political bombshell. Cronkite created a safe and trusting environment in which Ford appeared oblivious to the mass media dimension of the interview. Ford's behavior is perfectly logical from a therapeutic viewpoint but left political analysts fumbling for an explanation.

2. Political analysis focused on the content of the interview: on the making public of previously secret negotiations, personal desires, and political opinions. Therapeutic analysis shifted focus from the content of the communica-

tion to the structural qualities of the communication and how they functioned in that particular transaction. The "how," rather than the "what," became important. Using therapeutic analysis, the "how" explained the "what."

3. Political analysis treated the revelations in the interview as the starting point and emphasized potential effects, whether planned or accidental. Therapeutic analysis treated the self-revelations as a product of the meeting between a man with a problem and a set of facilitative conditions. Ironically, the very effects which were most self-destructive politically, were most healthful therapeutically. Personal risk-taking put the politician on the precipice of disaster, and the client on the edge of self-understanding. Thus the theoretic vantage selected for explanation dictated whether Ford's behaviors merit applause as growth or derision as stupidity.

4. Political analysis focused on public meanings: the potential effects of the interview on the larger political spectrum, the Republican party, and the national presidential campaign. Therapeutic analysis focused on personal meanings: pride, ethics, self-esteem. Therapeutic analysis revealed the extent to which Ford was engaged in personal self-exploration rather than public communication, the extent to which he enacted personal problem-solving rather than political bargaining. The up-shot of the analysis is that Ford's behavior is that of a man fervant more for self-understanding than for self-advancement.

Viewing the Cronkite-Ford interview as therapy altered the variables studied, the units of analysis chosen. The results are radically and meaningfully different from those of traditional political analysis. Clearly, the event had critical political ramifications that cannot be ignored. The interview threw political aspirants, and the entire convention, into disarray, and finally, the party into embarrassment and worry. But those very political outcomes are the reasons that the interview cannot be explained solely as politics.

Veteran politicians must have known the impossibility of keeping days of negotiation secret, with so many participants involved, and they must have realized the flurry that would result when the proposal leaked. So, in terms of political aspirations, hidden motives, Ford's openness makes little sense. His revelations were explosive with potential damage to all involved. But personal meanings, clarified in the context of facilitation, rather than in the context of political strategy, may have dictated his behavior, and the final outcome of the decision-making. In interpersonal terms, Ford's behavior makes sense and is congruent with his final decision. The resolution of the personal dimensions of the decision allowed Ford to address the political dimensions. With that shift came forced abandonment of the "dream ticket."

FOOTNOTES

[1] Transcripts for July 16, 1980 of CBS' "Campaign '80: The Republican National Convention," were supplied by CBS News.

[2] "Donohue," July 18, 1980. Donohue Transcript #07180 (Cincinnati: Multimedia Program Productions, 1980), p. 17.

[3] "Campaign '80," CBS News, p.3.

[4] After leaving the office of President of the United States, John Quincy Adams served as a member of the House of Representatives.

[5] "The Cement Just Wouldn't Set on GOP's Ideal Alliance," The Washington Post, 18 July 1980, pp. A1, A8.

[6] "Reagan-Bush News Conference and Acceptance Speech by Bush," The New York Times, 18 July 1980, p. A12.

[7] "The Making of the Ticket," The Washington Post, 18 July 1980, p. A12.

[8] "The Making of the Ticket," p. A12.

[9] "The Making of the Ticket," p. A12.

[10] Francis X. Clines, "Delirium from Rumors Fills the Morning After," The New York Times, 18 July 1980, p. A11.

[11] Clines, "Delirium," p. A11.

[12] George F. Will, "Reagan Passed the Test," The Washington Post, 18 July 1980, p. A13.

[13] Roland Evans and Robert Novak, "Ford Putsched Too Far," The Washington Post, 18 July 1980, p. A13. David S. Broder, "Carter Got Lucky," The Washington Post, 18 July 1980, p. A13, also characterized the negotiation as "demeaning."

[14] "How the Ford Deal Collapsed," Newsweek, 28 July 1980, p. 20.

[15] Adam Clymer, "Ford Sets His Terms for Joining Reagan as His Running Mate," The New York Times, 17 July 1980, pp. A1, B8.

[16] Broder, "Carter Got Lucky," p. A13; Evans and Novak, "Ford Putsched," p. A13.

[17] The convention was termed a "sleepwalk," by Tom Shales, "Live From Detroit: Glitter and Bah-loney," The Washington Post, 16 July 1980, pp. B1, B3, and "sound without fury," by Sally Quinn, "After the Grand Old Party," The Washington Post, 19 July 1980, pp. B1, B3. With an estimated 11,000 journalists in Detroit during the convention, "print and TV journalists were crawling all over each other to find something, anything to cover, eventually resorting to covering each other" (Quinn, pp. B1, B3).

[18] The biggest news story of the convention, up to that day, was, (and in the aftermath, continued to be the second most important source of reporters' focus): the very lack of news. Cameras showed delegates sleeping, yawning, trudging home early. There was little for delegates to do. There was little to report. The theme of the convention was unity. In an attempt to assure the image of unity, platforms conflicts had been ironed out prior to the opening gavel. With the presidential candidate known for months in advance, the convention was a celebration, an exercise in passive democratic representation. On Wednesday morning, July 16, The Washington Post's coverage of the convention captured well the lack of eventfulness in what is typically considered a major political event: "Suppose they gave a party and everybody came but nobody knew why. It's happening in Detroit right now, and the television networks are all but blowing their tops in the attempt to make something terribly meaningful out of the Republican National Convention;" Shales, "Live From Detroit," pp. B1, B3.

[19] "TV's Rush to Judgment," Newsweek, 28 July 1980, pp. 72-75.

[20] "Inside the Jerry Ford Drama," Time, 28 July 1980, p. 16.

[21] William F. Buckley, Jr., "Tigers in Detroit," The National Review, 8 August 1980, p. 966.

[22] "TV's Rush to Judgment," Newsweek, p. 72.

[23] John J. O'Connor, "TV: Covering the Big Story," The New York Times, 18 July 1980, p. A12.

[24] Donohue, p. 9.

[25] "Inside the Jerry Ford Drama," Time, p. 19.

[26] Lou Cannon and David S. Broder, "Efforts to Forge 'Dream Ticket' with Ford Fail," The Washington Post, 17 July 1980, pp. A1, A11.

[27] "How the Ford Deal Collapsed," Newsweek, p. 24.

[28] "TV's Rush to Judgment," Newsweek, p. 75.

[29] Will, "Reagan Passed," p. A13.

[30] Broder, p. A13.

[31] For example, see "And the One That Wasn't to Be," The Chicago Tribune, 18 July 1980, Section 3, p. 2; Broder, p. A13; Evans and Novak, p. A13; Tom Shales, "Camera Madness: Network Showdown at Republican Convention," The Washington Post, 18 July 1980, pp. C1, C8; A. O. Sulzberger, Jr., "Officials of 3 Networks Defend Coverage of Night of Speculation," The New York Times, 18 July 1980, p. A12; "TV's Rush to Judgment," Newsweek, p. 75; Will, Reagan Passed," p. A13.

[32] "And the One," The Chicago Tribune, p. 2.

[33] Donohue, p. 2.

[34] Shales, "Camera Madness," p. C8.

[35] "TV's Rush to Judgment," Newsweek, p. 75.

[36] "TV's Rush," Newsweek, p. 75.

[37] Broder, p. A13.

[38] Edward Walsh, "Detroit: A Few Smiles for Democrats," The Washington Post, 19 July 1980, p. A10.

[39] "The Making of the Ticket," p. A12.

[40] Richard Cohen, "With Reagan, Ford Met His Match," The Washington Post, 18 July 1980, p. B1.

[41] Donohue, p. 3.

[42] Lou Cannon and Martin Schram, "Ford's Support Boosts Bush as Running Mate," The Washington Post, 14 July 1980, pp. A1, A15, reported that, in fact, on Sunday of that week, Ford commented on the vice-presidential running mate choice in an appearance on ABC's "Issues and Answers." He praised Bush as "very attractive, very dedicated, experienced, a very unselfish individual, a very fine person." While not a direct endorsement, in comparison to others, Ford gave the strongest marks to Bush.

[43] Cannon and Schram, p. A1.

[44] Lou Cannon, "Ford Tells Reagan He Should Choose Bush for No 2 Spot," The Washington Post, 16 July 1980, pp. A1, A15.

[45] Cannon, "Ford Tells Reagan," p. A15.

[46] Cannon, "Ford Tells Reagan," p. A15.

[47] Donohue, p. 15.

[48] Coincidentally, on that same day, a Roper Organization poll (contrary to other current polls) showed Reagan and Carter in a dead heat in the presidential race, each with 40% of the support from registered and likely voters; see "Roper Survey Finds Carter, Reagan Tied." The Washington Post, 16 July 1980, p. A15. Private polls taken for Reagan showed Ford as the only possible running mate who could strengthen the Reagan ticket, according to Cannon and Broder, p. A1. Every other possibility was a detriment to Reagan. A Los Angeles Times national poll taken between June 29 and July 3 showed Ford and Bush tied in the eyes of the public as preferred running mate; see Jack Nelson, "Ford Declines Vice Presidential Offer," The Los Angeles Times, 17 July 1980, p. 1. But Ford outnumbered all possibilities in terms of name recognition.

His rate was 96% compared to 84% recognition for Bush; see Lou Cannon, "Bush Fills in Weak Spots for Reagan, Poll Shows," The Washington Post, 19 July 1980, p. A11. The set of polls accented the importance of the running mate selection.

[49] "The Cement," p. A8.

[50] Cannon and Broder, p. A1.

[51] "The Cement," p. A8.

[52] "The Cement," p. A8.

[53] Clymer, "Ford Sets His Terms," p. A1.

[54] Nelson, "Ford Declines," p. 1.

[55] William J. Eaton, "At 15 Minutes to Midnight, Ford's Answer Is 'No,'" The Los Angeles Times, 17 July 1980, pp. 1, 18.

[56] Leonard C. Hawes, Pragmatics of Analoguing (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1975).

[57] Abraham Kaplan, The Conduct of Inquiry (San Francisco: Chandler, 1964), p. 295.

[58] Max Black, Models and Metaphors (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1962), pp. 32-34.

[59] Hawes, p. 5.

[60] Jurgen Ruesch, Therapeutic Communication (New York: W. W. Norton, 1973), p. 31.

[61] H. H. Strupp, Psychotherapy: Clinical, Research, and Theoretical Issues (New York: Jason Aronson, 1973).

[62] Strupp, p. 1.

[63] For example, see Carl R. Rogers, On Becoming a Person (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961), p. 37; F. Van der Veen, "Effects of the Therapist and the Patient on Each Others' Therapeutic Behavior," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29(1965), 19-26.

[64] Robert R. Carkhuff and Charles B. Truax, "Toward Explaining Success or Failure in Interpersonal Experience," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 44(1966), 723-728.

[65] R. E. Fiedler, "A Comparison of Therapeutic Relationships in Psychoanalytic, Nondirective, and Adlerian Therapy," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 14(1950), 436-445. Fiedler's comparison of psychoanalytic, nondirective, and Adlerian therapy found common components to be the therapist's empathic rather than intellectual understanding.

[66] Fiedler, p. 444.

[67] Carl R. Rogers, "The Necessary and Sufficient Conditions of Therapeutic Personality Change," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21(1957), p. 96.

[68] Carl R. Rogers and Charles B. Truax, "The Therapeutic Conditions Antecedent to Change: A Theoretical View," in The Therapeutic Relationship and Its Impact, ed. Carl Rogers (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), pp. 97-108.

[69] "Campaign '80," p. 5.

[70] "Campaign '80," p. 5.

[71] The description was attributed to a former White House aide, in "Ford vs. Reagan Again?" Newsweek, 17 March 1980, p. 33.

[72] "Why Ford Finally Said No," Newsweek, 24 March 1980, p. 35.

[73] "Why Ford Finally Said No," p. 35.

[74] Martin Schram, "Ford, Roused by Last Hurrah, Clung for a While to the Torch," The Washington Post, 18 July 1980, p. A9.

[75] Clymer, p. B8.

[76] "Campaign '80," p. 5.

[77] David S. Broder and Lou Cannon, "Ford Agrees to Consider Taking No. 2 Spot," The Washington Post, 17 July 1980, pp. A1, A11.

[78] Betty Ford with Chris Chase, The Times of My Life (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), p. 272.

[79] "Inside the Jerry Ford Drama," Time, p. 16.

[80] Donohue, p. 11.

[81] Shales, "Camera Madness," p. C1.

[82] "A Foretaste of a Reagan Presidency," The Washington Post, 18 July 1980, pp. A1, A9; Howell Raines, "Ford Is Reported to Have Sought Many Concessions from Reagan," The New York Times, 18 July 1980, pp. A1, A11.

[83] Jon Margolis, "How Bush Got Ford's Spot on Ticket," The Chicago Tribune, 18 July 1980, pp. 1, 9.

[84] Morris B. Parloff, Ilene Elkin Waskow, and Barry E. Wolfe, "Research on Therapist Variables in Relation to Process and Outcome," in Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change, 2nd ed., ed. Sol L. Garfield and Allen E. Bergin (New York: Wiley, 1978), p. 242.

[85] Charles B. Truax and Kevin M. Mitchell, "Research on Certain Therapist Interpersonal Skills in Relation to Process and Outcome, in Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change: An Empirical Analysis (New York: Wiley, 1971), p. 310.

[86] This position was argued earlier by Rogers, "The Necessary and Sufficient Conditions."

[87] Kevin M. Mitchell, Jerold D. Bozarth, and Conrad C. Krauft, "A Reappraisal of the Therapeutic Effectiveness of Accurate Empathy, Nonpossessive Warmth, and Genuineness," in Effective Psychotherapy: A Handbook of Research, ed. Alan S. Gurman and Andrew M. Razin (New York: Pergamon Press, 1977), pp. 482-502.

[88] Charles B. Truax, "The Process of Group Psychotherapy: Relationships Between Hypothesized Therapeutic Conditions and Intrapersonal Exploration," Psychological Monographs, 75 No 7 (1961), 1-35.

[89] See research by K. A. Bundza and N. R. Simonson, "Therapist Self-Disclosure: Its Effects on Impressions of Therapist and Willingness to Disclose," Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 10(1973), 215-217, and Charles B. Truax, "Therapist Interpersonal Reinforcement of Client Self-Exploration and Therapeutic Outcome in Group Psychotherapy," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 15(1968), 225-231, as cited in Charles B. Truax and Robert R. Carkhuff, "Client and Therapist Transparency in the Psychotherapeutic Encounter," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 12(1965), pp. 3-9.

[90] Bundza and Simonson, p. 216.

[91] Rogers, On Becoming.

[92] Thomas Gordon, Parent Effectiveness Training (New York: Peter H. Wyden, 1970).

[93] Timothy R. Cline, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of 'You-Messages' and 'I-Messages' on the Helping Relationship and Defensiveness," M. A. Thesis, California State University, Sacramento, 1971.

[94] Rebecca J. Cline and Bonnie McD. Johnson, "The Verbal Stare: Focus of Attention in Conversation," Communication Monographs, 43(1976), 1-10.

[95] Leonard C. Hawes, "The Effects of Interviewer Style on Patterns of Dyadic Communication," Speech Monographs, 39(1972), 114-123.

[96] Barbara S. Dohrenwend, "Some Effects of Open and Closed Questions on Respondents' Answers," Human Organization, 24(1965), 175-184; Elaine M. Hawes, "Effects of Question Order on the Interview Process," Speech Communication Association, Chicago, 1974.

[97] For example, see Ralph V. Exline, "Effects of Need for Affiliation, Sex, and the Sight of Others Upon Initial Communications in Problem-Solving Groups," Journal of Personality, 30(1962), 541-556; Ralph V. Exline, "Explorations in the Process of Person Perception: Visual Interaction in Relation to Competi-

tion, Sex, and Need for Affiliation," Journal of Personality, 31(1963), 1-20; Francis D. Kelly, "Communicational Significance of Therapist Proxemic Cues," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 39(1972), 345; Albert Mehrabian, "A Semantic Space for Nonverbal Behavior," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 35(1970), 248-257.

[98] For example, see Ralph V. Exline and L. Winters, "Affective Relations and Mutual Glances in Dyads," in Affect, Cognition and Personality, ed. S. S. Tomkins and C. E. Izard (New York: Springer, 1965) pp. 319-350; C. N. Goldberg, Charles A. Kiesler, and Barry E. Collins, "Visual Behavior and Face-to-Face Distance During Interaction," Sociometry, 32(1969), 43-53; Michael B. La Crosse, "Nonverbal Behavior and Perceived Counselor Attractiveness and Persuasiveness," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22(1975), 563-566.

[99] Richard F. Haase and Donald T. Tepper, Jr., "Nonverbal Components of Empathic Communication," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 19(1972), 417-424; Donald T. Tepper, Jr. and Richard F. Haase, "Verbal and Nonverbal Communication of Facilitative Conditions," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25(1978), 35-44.

[100] L. Krasner, "Studies of the Conditioning of Verbal Behavior," Psychological Bulletin, 55(1958), 148-170; M. M. Reece and R. N. Whitman, "Expressive Movements, Warmth, and Verbal Reinforcement," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 64(1962), 234-236.

[101] Tepper and Haase.

[102] Tepper and Haase.

[103] James R. Graves and John D. Robinson, II., "Proxemic Behaviors as a Function of Inconsistent Verbal and Nonverbal Messages," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23(1976), 333-338; Thomas A. Seay and Michael K. Altekruse, "Verbal and Nonverbal Behavior in Judgments of Facilitative Conditions," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26(1979), 108-119.

[104] Mehrabian, "A Semantic Space," pp. 248-257; Albert Mehrabian, "Some Determinants of Affiliation and Conformity," Psychological Reports, 27(1970), 19-29; Albert Mehrabian, "Verbal and Nonverbal Interaction of Strangers in a Waiting Situation," Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 5(1971), 127-138.

[105] La Crosse.

[106] M. A. Bayes, "Behavioral Cues of Interpersonal Warmth," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 39(1972), 333-339.

[107] Anthony R. D'Augelli, "Nonverbal Behavior of Helpers in Initial Helping Interactions," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 21(1974), 360-363; Reece and Whitman.

[108] Bruce R. Fretz, "Postural Movements in a Counseling Dyad," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 13(1966), 335-343.

[109] D'Augelli.

[110] Fretz.

[111] Fretz.

[112] Kelly; Mehrabian, "A Semantic Space Space;" Albert Mehrabian, "Some Referents and Measures of Nonverbal Behavior," Behavior Research Methods and Instrumentation, 1(1969), 203-207.

[113] Haase and Tepper.

[114] Reece and Whitman.

[115] Tepper and Haase.

[116] La Crosse.

[117] Fretz; Graves and Robinson; Seay and Altekruse.

[118] Fretz.

[119] W. T. James, "A Study of the Expression of Bodily Posture," Journal of General Psychology, 7(1932), 405-437; Albert Mehrabian, "Nonverbal Betrayal of

Feeling," Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 5(1971) 64-73; Reece and Whitman.

[120] Albert Mehrabian, "Inference of Attitudes from the Posture, Orientation, and Distance of a Communicator," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32(1968), 296-308.

[121] Haase and Tepper; Tepper and Haase.

[122] Rogers, "The Necessary and Sufficient Conditions."

[123] Ferdinand van der Veen and T. M. Tomlinson, "A Scale for the Rating of Manner of Problem Expression," in The Therapeutic Relationship and Its Impact, ed. Carl R. Rogers (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), p. 599.

[124] "Campaign '80," CBS News.

[125] Charles B. Truax, "A Scale for the Rating of Accurate Empathy," in The Therapeutic Relationship and Its Impact, ed. Carl R. Rogers (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), pp. 555-568.

[126] Charles B. Truax, "A Tentative Scale for the Rating of Unconditional Positive Regard," in The Therapetuic Relationship and Its Impact, ed. Carl R. Rogers (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), pp. 569-579.

[127] Donald J. Kiesler, "A Scale for the Rating of Congruence," in The Therapeutic Relationship and Its Impact, ed. Carl R. Rogers (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), pp. 581-584.

[128] van der Veen and Tomlinson, pp. 599-601.

[129] The pre-established minimum standards for reliability were 70% agreement on category judgments and .70 correlations on rating scales.

[130] Hawes, "The Effects of Interviewer Style."

[131] Charles B. Truax and Robert R. Carkhuff, Toward Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy (Chicago: Aldine, 1967).

[132] Michael Argyle and R. Ingham, "Gaze, Mutual Gaze and Proximity,"

Semiotica, 6(1972), 32-49; G. Nielson, Studies in Self Confrontation (Copenhagen: Monksgaard, 1962).

[133] Tepper and Haase.

[134] Kelly.

[135] Cal W. Downs, G. Paul Smeyak, and Ernest Martin, Professional Interviewing (New York: Harper and Row, 1980), p. 188.

[136] Downs, Smeyak, and Martin, p. 188.

[137] Schram, p. A9.

[138] "Campaign '80," CBS News, p. 2.

[139] "Campaign '80," CBS News, p. 2.

[140] "Campaign '80," CBS News, p. 3.

[141] "Campaign '80," CBS News, p. 3.

[142] "Campaign '80," CBS News, p. 3.

[143] "Campaign '80," CBS News, p. 4.

[144] "Campaign '80," CBS News, p. 4.

[145] "Campaign '80," CBS News, p. 5.

[146] "Campaign '80," CBS News, p. 5.

[147] "Campaign '80," CBS News, p. 8.

Table 1

Intra-Rater and Inter-Rater Reliability Estimates

Measure	Intra-Rater$_1$	Intra-Rater$_2$	Inter-Rater
Facilitative Messages*	87.50%	95.83%	76.79%
Empathy	.91	.85	.83
Acceptance	.96	.91	.54**
Congruence	.86	.84	.73
Problem-Expression	1.00	.97	.95

* Reliablility estimates for coding message types are summarized in terms of percent-of-agreement; all others are in the form of Pearson-product-moment correlations.

** The measure of congruence was dropped from the analyses due to inadequate inter-rater reliability.

Table 2

Facilitation, Nonfacilitation, and Information Giving By Cronkite

Message Type	No. of Messages	Proportion of Total*
Facilitation	24	.43
Reflective Listening	2	(.04)
I-Messages	13	(.23)
Open-Questions	9	(.16)
Nonfacilitation	21	.38
You-Messages	7	(.13)
Closed Questions	14	(.25)
Information Giving	11	.20

* Due to rounding error the proportions total 1.01.

Table 3

Results of Ratings of Cronkite's Communication as Providing Facilitative Conditions

Facilitative Condition	Average Rating	Proportion of Minutes Classified Facilitative	Proportion of Minutes Classified Nonfacilitative	Proportion of Neutral Statements
Empathy (Scale of 1-9)	5.79	.71	.24	.05
Genuineness (Scale of 1-5)	3.86	.81*	.10	.10

* Proportions sum to 1.01 due to rounding error.